

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, as amended, remain herein. Claims 9 and 10 are currently withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview of March 29, 2006, during which the amendments to claim 1 presented in this Amendment were discussed. Applicants' representative, Tyson Winarski, discussed how Bisping and Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) fail to disclose a sabot segment that has three support seats of substantially full gun caliber with the median support seat having a pusher plate, as recited in claim 1. Both Bisping and the AAPA show sabot segments having only two seats, not three as claimed by applicants. Element 43 shown in Bisping is in fact a disk that is not connected to segment 21. Thus, Bisping does not disclose three support seats as claimed by applicants. Based upon this discussion, the Examiner stated that currently amended claim 1 appeared to overcome the rejections based on the cited art, but the Examiner indicated a desire to consider the amendment further.

1. Claim 2 is amended, thereby mooting the rejection under 35 USC §112, paragraph 2.
2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over applicants' prior art

Figure 2 and Bisping U.S. Patent 4,444,114.

As discussed in the interview, neither applicants' prior art Figure 2 nor Bisping discloses a sabot segment having three support seats as claimed by applicants. Applicants' prior art Figure 2 shows a sabot segment having two support seats, 2 and 8. Bisping also discloses a sabot segment having only two support seats, 29 and 33. Bisping's disk 43 that supports the tail of

Serial No.: 10/626,555
Docket No.: 28971.0104

projectile 12 is not attached to segment 21. Thus, Bisping and applicants' prior art Figure 2 do not disclose a sabot segment that has three support seats as claimed by applicants.

Claim 4, which depends on claim 1, is allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claim 1.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of Bisping or applicants' prior art Figure 2 that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Bisping or applicants' prior art Figure 2 that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

3. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over applicants' prior art Figure 2, Bisping, and applicants' Figure 1.

4. Claim 2, which depends on claim 1, is allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claim 1. Applicants' Figure 1 does not show a sabot segment having three support seats as claimed by applicants. Applicants' Figure 1 discloses a sabot segment having only two support seats.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of Bisping or applicants' prior art Figures 1 or 2 that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Bisping or

Serial No.: 10/626,555
Docket No.: 28971.0104

applicants' prior art Figures 1 or 2 that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claim 2 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

5. Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over applicants' prior art Figure 2, Bisping, and Campoli U.S. Patent 5,359,938.

Claims 5 and 6, which depend on claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained above herein for claim 1. Campoli does not show a sabot segment having three support seats as claimed by applicants. Campoli discloses a sabot segment having only two support seats, 44 and 36.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Bisping, applicants' prior art Figure 2, or Campoli that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Bisping, applicants' prior art Figure 2, or Campoli that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 5 and 6 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/626,555
Docket No.: 28971.0104

Accordingly, the application is now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 28951.5324). If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Tyson Y. Winarski
Registration No. 41,381

Date: April 4, 2006

RWP/TYW/mnl
Attorney Docket No.: 28971.0104

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-6420
Fax: (202) 828-3658